

REMARKS

Claims 1-40 are pending in the application, with claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15, 26-28, 32 and 33 rejected, claims 5, 7, 10, 14, 16, 17, and 34 objected to, claims 29-31 allowed, and claims 18-25 and 35-40 withdrawn from consideration.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5, 7, 10, 14, 16, 17, and 34, and the allowance of claims 29-31.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15, and 26-28 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prestifilippo et al. (US Patent No. 5,446,889; hereinafter, "Prestifilippo") in view of Kodosky et al. (US Patent No. 6,608,638; hereinafter, "Kodosky"), and claims 32 and 33 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prestifilippo in view of Kodosky, and further in view of Chintalapati et al. (US Patent Appln. No. 2002/0120710; hereinafter, "Chintalapati"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the reasons set forth below.

Neither Prestifilippo nor Kodosky, alone or in combination, suggests a method of operating hardware resources in a wireless communication device, as required by the claimed invention. Prestifilippo is instead directed generally to a linked-list method, and Kodosky is directed generally to a computer-implemented system and method for generating a hardware implementation of graphical code. There is no logical basis for combining these references in the context of operating resources of a wireless communication device. Thus, the claims are patentable over the applied references for at least this reason.

Additionally, as asserted in the previous response, the applied references do not suggest performing in real time while the wireless communication device is operating, as also required by the claimed invention.

The Examiner responds on page 4 of the Office Action by asserting that "Kodosky teaches wherein the method is performed in real time while the wireless communication device is operating (*col. 17, lines 50-56*)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position. Again, as discussed above, Kodosky does not involve a wireless communication device. Further, Kodosky involves using graphical code to generate a hardware function on a programmable hardware element. While the portion of Kodosky to which the Examiner refers mentions "real time", it is in the context of a bus routing timing and trigger signals while creating the hardware element. The claimed invention, on the other hand, is designed for real time coordinating, via scheduling and allocation, a set of hardware resources. Thus, while Kodosky does discuss a real time bus routing function during hardware *creation*, it does not suggest real time *operation* of hardware, let alone a wireless communication device. Thus, the claimed invention is patentable over the applied references for this additional reason.

Application No. 09/927,906
Amendment dated December 1, 2006
Reply to Office Action of September 1, 2006

Docket No.: I4303.0053

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: December 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Laura C. Brutman
Laura C. Brutman

Registration No.: 38,395
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant